DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 817 AC 004 715

By-Ferver, Jack C.

Needed: An Urban Extension Service; Trends, Problems and Possibilities under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Pub Date 69

Note-26p.; A Paper presented at the Regional Title I Conference (St. Louis, Mo., March 27-28, 1969).

Available from-Wisconsin Title I HEA Administrator, 432 N. Lake St., Madison, Wisconsin, 53706

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40

Descriptors-*Community Service Programs, Disadvantaged Groups, Financial Support, Personnel Needs, Program Evaluation, *Program Improvement, *Universities, *Urban Extension

Identifiers-*Higher Education Act of 1965

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has demonstrated that institutions of higher learning can make an important contribution to the solution of community problems through community service projects. But there are limitations, the greatest of which are lack of adequate program funds and mounting program needs, particularly for programs relating to the problems of the poor in our central cities. The great potential is in developing Title I into an Urban Extension Service with organizational linkages between federal, state, and urban governments, urban citizens, and urban-grant colleges and universities. (author/pt)

ED030817

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NEEDED: AN URBAN EXTENSION SERVICE

Trends, Problems and Possibilities under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965

A
Paper Presented at the Regional Title I Conference
St. Louis, Missouri
March 27-28, 1969
by

Jack C. Ferver
Title I Administrator for Wisconsin

AC004715

Note: Dr. Ferver is the Director of the Center for Extension Programs in Education, University Extension, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

I. INTRODUCTION

Fred H. Harrington, President, The University of Wisconsin, stated in November, 1966 that Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965

> "is a bill of such fundamental importance that perhaps it is as important as anything passed in the education field in the last few years."[1]

Today, more than two years after making this statement, President Harrington, who has remained active on State and National Advisory Councils for Title I, must be painfully aware that the promise of Title I has not yet been fulfilled, and must sometimes wonder if it ever will.

What has happened? What are the trends and problems? What are the possibilities? From the perspective of one concerned with the development of a state plan and the administration of a state program from its beginnings, it seems from an analysis of trends and problems that what this country still needs is a good Urban Extension Service!

II. TRENDS

A. Relevance in Higher Education

In 1965 most institutions of higher education were quite willing to confine their activities to resident instruction. Few were engaged in research on community problems though a

---

[1] Fred H. Harrington, "University Extension: Challenge and Opportunity for the Urban University," address to the Association of Urban Universities, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, November, 1966, published in NUEA Specatator, October, 1967, p. 5.

sizeable number were engaged in continuing education for graduates of their professional schools. Very few were engaged in community service and community problem solving. Lately, the trend has been for institutions to become relevant to the problems of the day as identified by students and citizens. The trend out of the ivory tower into the marketplace is persistent, and this trend will certainly in the next few years see increased support for community service work of higher education institutions.

B. Disillusionment with Title I

Like so many new programs, Title I raised expectations which it has not been able to meet. Failure to appropriate funds at authorized levels has meant that only a few new projects could be funded each year, and these generally at levels which prohibit even a single full time staff member on project funds. When Federal appropriations were reduced this year from $10,000,000 to $9,500,000, a number of people lost interest in struggling to write proposals, find matching funds and get involved. Also, it is obvious that not many major problems have been "solved" through the pilot projects and the limited education and demonstration programs under Title I. Thus there has been a trend toward increased disillusionment.

C. Trends within Title I Program Administration

The character of Title I has changed considerably during its three years of life. Some of the more important trends within Title I are the following:

1. Trend away from problem solving programs toward building institutional interest and capacity in helping responsible agencies, organizations and individuals solve problems. Direct action programs by units in colleges and universities are giving way to building capacity in colleges and universities to respond to the educational needs of those having problem solving responsibility. An important change which is reflected in this trend is that it is now more legitimate to use Title I funds to build community service units in colleges and universities. This trend is increasingly reflected in the two-step program process of (1) build institutional capacity to (2) build agency capacity to solve problems.

2. Trend away from funding projects toward funding programs. This trend is directly related to the trend toward building institutional capacity described above. The futility of short-term community service projects which have no continuing commitment has initiated a trend toward helping institutions

and/or responsible agencies establish program units which will continue work after Title I funds are withdrawn.

3. Trend toward making planning activities more legitimate. Using program funds for planning was at first considered a violation of Title I regulations, and planning activities had to either be camouflaged as "community leadership development" or be included as a first and minor phase of a two-phase planning-education project. Now it is more generally recognized that the limited funds available might best be used in planning activities which include identification of resources needed for adequate problem solving efforts.

4. Trend toward emphasizing program evaluation. Since it has become recognized that not enough Title I funds are available to solve major problems, it has become increasingly recognized that something should be learned from each project funded from existing funds, and this requires a good evaluation.

5. Trend toward emphasizing program reporting. Related to the trend for increasing the emphasis on evaluation in order to learn from projects is the increasing emphasis on reporting what was learned through projects in order to maximize their educational utility.

6. Trend toward accepting community development as a legitimate Title I activity. Because of the nature of the community development process which allows specific project activity to grow out of institutional involvement in helping a community look at itself, community development projects were earlier held to violate Title I intent to focus on solving specific problems. The trend now is to accept projects with well designed processes for becoming involved in a community on its terms.

7. Trend away from a rural, suburban focus toward a focus on urban problems. Title I legislation calls for inclusion of "urban, suburban and rural problems with emphasis on urban and suburban." The trend, however, has been toward problems in the heart of the city and its ghettos. Writing in January, 1969 NUEA Spectator, Conrad Mallett of Wayne State University defined the term "Urban Problem" as the following:

> "...This phrase is used often to describe the entire array of problems that affect our metropolitan areas. Most of the time, however, it is a euphemism for the troublesome presence of the increasing numbers of black poor in cities. The euphemism does not offend me. When America becomes skilled and committed enough to solve the problems of the black poor in the cities, the urban problems, overcrowded streets, air pollution, etc., will be easily solved.[2]

---

[2]Conrad Mallett, "The Urban Community," NUEA Spectator, January, 1969 p. 16.

Urban problems, thus defined, have pushed their way to the center of the stage, and the trend has been toward focusing increased amounts of Title I's limited resources as well as many other of our Nation's resources on them.

8. Trend away from institutional determination toward self-determination. Related to the trend toward focusing on problems of black poor in cities is the trend toward self-determination by these black poor of the nature of their involvement with the university.

9. Trend away from continuing education toward community service. The descriptive program title for Title I is "Community Service and Continuing Education." Continuing education under Title I generally involves the continuing professional advancement of agency personnel for which either the individuals or their agency expect to pay a fee. The trend is away from such projects toward those designed to train people to perform community services. In very few community service projects is it possible to collect a fee from participants, making it necessary to have 100% subsidy in most cases.

III. Problems

Most of the problems facing Title I were stated or implied in the trends described above, but a brief enumeration would include the following:

A. Inadequacy of Appropriations

We are facing an army with a popgun. Not only are we short of Federal appropriations, but only Virginia, West Virginia, Kansas and Connecticut have invested state funds in the program. Matching funds in public institutions usually come from their state approrpations, but in many public institutions and in all private institutions there is a serious lack of matching funds. Title I's biggest problem is its lack of reasonably adequate Federal funds and lack of State matching funds.

B. Lack of Start-Up Base in Many Institutions of Higher Education

Community service work is like most everything else in that "it takes money to make money." It takes a basic staff to start-up a program and get it funded. It takes time to develop a fundable proposal. Rutgers University, Associate Dean, Madison E. Weidner commented only slightly facetiously recently on the problems of proposal writing in his efforts to get Title VIII, Housing Act of 1964 funds:

> "In closing I should like to mention that you might gauge the dollar amount of funding

> that your proposals will receive by the use of a ruler. Our first proposal got nowhere but then again it was only one-sixteenth of an inch thick. Our second proposal was an inch and a half thick and we were funded for $105,000. The present rate appears to be about $35,000 per half inch."[3]

If something cannot be done to provide a start-up base or an equalizer of another sort, the tendency is for the rich to get richer. The tragedy of not having a start-up base is that too many institutions of higher education are too slow in assuming their rightful community service responsibility.

C. Lack of Research Base

One reason the Agricultural Extension Service has done such an outstanding job of contributing to the development of the agricultural enterprise in this country is the supporting system of Agricultural Experiment Stations. No such system exists to support community service work on urban problems, although there is some research of a relevant nature being conducted by institutions of higher education and other research organizations throughout the country. The Urban Observatories now being funded by HUD in six cities have promise, but much more needs to be done.

---

[3] Madison E. Weidner, "Title VIII Program-Housing Act of 1964," Adult Leadership, February 1969, p. 361.

D. Lack of A Comprehensive, Coordinated Statewide System for Community Service

While the problem today is lack of total effort by institutions of higher education in the community service area and not in competition or duplication, to obtain efficiency and effectiveness in spending public funds statewide systems of community services should be established. Though the problems of developing a system are great, Title I has demonstrated in many states that it can help establish such a system.

E. Faulty Institutional Decisions Engendered by the Availability of Program Dollars

Institutionsl priorities often are so poorly defined in the public service arena that the enthusiasm of some staff member who knows where he can get some money leads the institution down a primrose path. The problem comes later when the outside funds are gone and the institutions is faced with the alternative of continuing the program with its own funds or dropping it. Too many Title I projects have been dropped in this way.

F. Projectites

Related to the above is the whole problem of funding short range projects in contrast to developing institutional program capacity on a long term basis. Title I has a project approach, and this must be changed into a program approach in order to

build lasting institutional commitment. Short-term projects to allow an established organization a chance to develop and test a new dimension such as a new seminar have performed rather well, but also needed is funding on a long-range basis of new organizational forms and the programs of these new forms. The decision to fund a new center or institute and its programs over a long enough period to help it become firmly established is a highly important decision for both the institution and the state, and present Title I machinery is not dealing with this challenge adequately.

G. Needed: A Name

There are a dozen Title I's. No one uses "Community Service and Continuing Education." A big factor in Title I's failure to win public and legislative support is in its lack of well defined mission and identity. Title I needs a name.

IV. Possibilities

My hope is that Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 may yet prove to be a means of bringing a large amount of college and university talent to bear through community service programs on the pressing urban problems of our Nation. A companion hope is that an urban research service can be established to help provide the organized base of knowledge which is needed by those engaging in community service on urban problems.

Under present conditions there is little possibility that these hopes may be realized. Four years of extremely limited funding, considering the nature of the task and the organizational provision to encourage all institutions of higher education to enter the frey, has sapped enthusiasm and support. The sponsoring Johnson administration has left office and the war goes on. State and local fiscal problems preclude new money going into higher education for anything but increased resident student enrollments. Some well known leaders of university extension have become disillusioned with Title I because it has failed to meet their needs. For instance, Everett J. Soop, Dean of Extension at the University of Michigan wrote in a somewhat critical article on Title I, "I still hope federal funds may sometime be made available for more programs on a graduate level for those adults interested in continuing education in all fields related to general knowledge maintenance."[4]

Wherein, then, does hope lie? It must be in the determination of our society to do something about the mounting crises facing our cities, and the need to mobilize university resources in the struggle to solve urban problems. With some modification, Title I could provide the means of bringing substantial college and university resources to bear on urban problems. Challenges have been made and suggestions offered by a number of national leaders which could provide the basis for realizing the new possibilities.

---

[4] Everett J. Soop, "Title I and Extension Programs: One Person's View," NUEA Spectator, June-July, 1968, p. 18.

The challenge usually is for colleges and universities to get out of their ivory towers and become "relevant." Sidney Harries has contended, for instance, that "if universities cannot intellectualize their neighborhoods, at least to some degree, then their influence on the social current is negligible and their pretension to significance is absurd."[5]

In his January 12, 1965 meesage on education to Congress, President Johnson suggested it was time for the university to face the problem of the city as it once faced the problem of the farm:

> "The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty muet be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university all should be brought into play."[6]

J. Martin Klotsche, Chancellor of The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee states in his book The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities:

> "While there have been islands of academic inquiry into the urban field, there has been nothing to parallel the exhaustive study of American Agriculture that has characterized university endeavor during the past 100 years. A comparable effort in depth and breadth in the urban field still needs to be made."[7]

Chancellor Klotsche goes on to describe how an urban university can contribute to the urban community:

> "The university can provide a common meeting ground for the divergent elements of the community and assist in reaching an objective understanding of its problems

---

[5] Sidney Harris, Pittsburgh Post Gazette, November 6, 1963.

[6] L.B. Johnson, Congressional Record, January 12, 1965.

[7] J. Martin Klotsche, The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities (Harper and Row, New York, 1966), p. 28.

> while at the same time providing the basis for the development of theory and policy for general application elsewhere. No community issue, whether it results from social strain, racial tension, religious conflict, nationality origin, or labor-management disagreement, should be beyond the interest of the university scholar.
>
> A university can discharge this responsibility as no other institution can. It can examine the metropolis in its totality, seeing each problem in relationship to the whole. It can seek to identify both the shortcomings and the accomplishments of the community. It can rise above the local prejudices and see beyond the political fragmentation that characterizes our metropolitan areas. It can be a constructive critic, a standard setter, a balancing force. It can help blaze new trails. It can stand over and above the tumult and shouting of the marketplace. It can speak out boldly on matters of principle, and bring clarity to community thought in a climate free of bias and emotionalism. It can seek to identify not only what is and can be, but what should be."[8]

Chancellor Klotsche concludes that in the urgent concerns of our cities "the urban university can play a central role. It can, in fact, become the single most important force in the re-creation of our cities."[9]

Not all educational leaders are yet convinced, however, and the debate goes on.

President Fred H. Harrington has challenged Logan Wilson's position that universities should not become involved in public service but limit their concerns to campus activities of teaching and research. But Mr. Wilson heads the American Council of Education whose polls of excellence are based upon basic research and graduate study, while Mr. Harrington heads a university system whose units include an urban

---

[8] Ibid., p. 30.

[9] Ibid., p. 128.

university in Milwaukee. Mr. Harrington's position has expressed the hope that, "If urban universities do begin thinking a little differently, perhaps the ACE will find it necessary to make a ranking a little later as to institutions which are contributing to the welfare of man by their work in the extension and public service fields." Just what urban universities might do a "little differently" is expressed by Mr. Harrington in this way:

> "We all hope that plenty of money will go into pure research. We all know you cannot have applications unless you have a continuing flow of persons who are trying to investigate problems without any clear notion of an immediate application. But there is no mistaking this appeal from the federal government to the universities to do a little more applied research, a little more extension, a little more public service work. This probably is the big theme of higher education legislation for the 60's and 70's.
>
> In consequence, we face an opportunity which the urban universities ought to seize. The other institutions are not closed out from this. The great state universities which operate state-wide should be able to adjust themselves to this extension and public service legislation quite well. But it is in the cities that the public and private universities really have the opportunity to pitch in and do the job, not only to be in the city, but to be of the city."[10]

Nor are all leaders of our communities convinced from what they have seen of the involvement of colleges and universities in the urban scene that our institutions want to make a response to the urban crises. This skepticism is reflected in the public press. Speaking at The University of Wisconsin Adult Education Conference on the Urban Agent, Paul Miller had many constructive ideas as to how colleges and universities

---

[10] F. H. Harrington, "The Urban University and Extension, NUEA Spectator, October-November, 1967, p.6.

might relate to their urban communities. It is interesting to note, however, that the leads in news stories reporting Dr. Miller's speech all picked up the comments he made regarding the need for universities to become more involved and more relevant:

"Urban universities in America are suffering from a grave case of irrelevance," reported Nancy Heinberg of the Madison Capital Times on July 2, 1968.

"Universities must become members of a larger, more representative organization if they are to help the disadvantaged," reported Gerry Hinkley of the Milwaukee Sentinel on July 2, 1968.

"Universities could give important help in solving big city problems if they could shake loose from their present self-satisfied attitudes," reported David Behrendt of the Milwaukee Journal, July 2, 1968.

Those who are examining the possibilities of Title I may find today's strongest ray of hope in the following statement by the Nixon Task Force on Education:

> "In considering the pressing problems of urban education, the task force recognizes a current disillusionment in the ghettos with university-based urban assistance. But it believes that the urban universities and colleges, nonetheless, constitute a vital resource for urban education improvement. If this resource can be substantially strengthened, the institutions can play the same kind of role for urban education that the land-grant colleges did in an earlier era for agriculture and rural life. The new Administration therefore is urged to use every means at its disposal, particularly through Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, to find well-designed university programs that give promise of being of direct assistance to improving inner-city education."

Modifications and changes which would enable Title I to provide the basis for greatly expanded involvement in community service work in urban communities would include the following:

A. New Name--Urban Extension Service

This new name is deliberately chosen to provide a comparable system to the Cooperative or Agricultural Extension Service which has its Federal base in the Department of Agriculture. The Urban Extension Service would obviously not have the broad concern of present Title I programs which include rural problems, and would lose some political support from rural areas which the 1965 Act had. This proposed focus on urban problems, however, would no doubt net more support than Title I now has.

B. New System--Urban Grant Colleges and Universities
--Urban Extension Service
--Urban Research Service

Clark Kerr expressed the view in 1967 that a special chain of land-grant universities could produce in the cities the success that urban-grant colleges had demonstrated in the rural society.[11]

Some of the references cited earlier draw parallels between the Agricultural or Cooperative Extension Service and the need for a new involvement of colleges and universities with similar efforts in cities. It is useful in conceptualizing an Urban Extension Service in an Urban-Grant University to examine more carefully what has been said.

---

[11] Fred M. Hechinger, "A Call for the Urban-Grant College, The New York Times, October 22, 1967.

While he was Assistant Secretary for Education in HEW Paul Miller analyzed the lessons of the Agricultural or Cooperative Extension Service in relation to the new urban challenge. He concluded:

> "First, while analogies are helpful, they will not easily give us the methodology necessary for improving the quality of urban life.
>
> Second, the rural precedent teaches us something of the desperate need we have of a design--at once local and national--for urban development; a stable and coherent design. Without one, there cannot be the focusing of the public will vital to success. Without one, the typical pattern is large aims, high expectations, quick starts, and...a dull thud.
>
> Third, the community itself has become the classroom. How communications media and institutional systems may fuse in a new conception of community education, in which everyone teaches and everyone learns, is a question which bears on the outcomes of modern society. What has happened in rural America in the last hundred years may not show us exactly how to do it; what it does show us is that it can be done."[12]

John E. Bebout, Director of the Urban Studies at Rutgers University has made a number of observations of strengths to be gained but pitfalls to be avoided from the Agricultural model:

> "There are, of course, difficlut questions as what to extend and to whom to extend it. Since the universities do not and cannot have a monopoly of the knowledge business, I would

---

[12] Paul A. Miller, "Informal Education: The Rural Precedent and the Urban Challenge," Fourth Health, Education and Welfare Forum, January 17, 1968, Washington, D.C., p. 14.

suggest a number of rules of thumb:

> They should not extend material or employ adult education change agents that could just as well be extended or employed by some other institution.
>
> They should not allow the service or extension side of their operation to detract from or weaken their basic research and academic programs.
>
> On the other hand, their extension programs should be so organized and managed as actually to strengthen and nourish research and academic education.

On the last point, general and 'urban' extension can take a leaf from the agricultural book, because the land-grant college system rests firmly on the three mutually supporting pillars of research, education and extension. So far as I know, no university has yet integrated or related general extension with its other basic functions in so effective a manner. Unfortunately, general and therefore urban extension tend to be looked down upon by the rest of the academic community as poor and somewhat deplorable relations. Correction of this condition will require substantial changes in attitudes, structure, and relationships within the university. Until this comes about, most universities will be considerably less than fully effective in meeting the challenges or imperatives of total and interdependent involvement in the life and destiny of modern urban society....one of the most important functions of extension is to help the university discover competencies it does not possess but ought to develop. Extension, then, should be not simply at the cutting edge, but truly at the growing edge of the university's thrust into the future."[13]

---

[13] John E. Bebout, "Role and Functions of Adult Education Change Agents in Urban Society," in Beyond the Four Walls, Robert D. Boyd, editor, University Extension, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 1969, pp. 68-69.

By far the most significant effort to get universities involved in urban extension prior to Title I was the Ford Urban Project. From 1959 to 1966 the Ford Foundation made grants totaling 4.5 million dollars to eight universities for experiments in applying the nation's university resources directly to the problems of American cities. In its report of these efforts the following statements are made which indicate some of the accomplishments, lessons and limitations of these urban extension programs and projects.

> "The most significant consequence of most of of the experiments was that they helped local communities create a structured means by which to participate in the national war on poverty. Neighborhoods in which extension programs operated were better equipped to organize for the antipoverty programs than other areas in the same cities. Similarly, the engagement of the universities enhanced their ability to serve state and local governments in setting up community action programs to meet Federal requirements. Federal poverty programs, more than any other factor, gave shape and purpose to the urban extension programs. They provided a timely crucible in which new ideas and programs were formed.
>
> Another important by-product of urban extension programs was the working liaison that was established between the universities and governmental agencies. In some instances the universities were drawn into a continuing role of helping local and state governments develop and implement urban programs. Often the university was looked upon as a neutral forum where ideas could be exchanged and programs instituted outside a partisan political framework.
>
> Finally, the experiments crystallized a set of critical questions that universities must resolve if they are to deal effectively with the problems of an urban society:
>
> ---Are universities presently structured to assume urban commitments? There appears to

be a growing realization that responsiveness to the urban environment calls for an across-the-board commitment. An isolated department or division devoted to urban affairs appears to have limited impact upon the university as a whole.

---Are there limits to the university engagement in community conflict? In some urban-extension experiments, university-trained personnel have engaged in disputes with city officials and other local powers.

---To what extent are universities inhibited from possible involvement? In one case, a proposed police-training course was abandoned because of fear of such involvement.

---Can universities that undertake extension operations use the same system of academic rewards for staff as they use in so-called line departments? The traditional rewards of promotion and academic recognition are still based upon scholarship, research, and professional association, rather than upon the service functions performed by the new breed of academicians whose extracurricular labor is extension work in the field.

---Can the proper incentives be provided to attract the talent and skills needed to do the extension job in the cities? The great demand for professional assistance in urban matters places new emphasis upon the university training programs as well as upon the use of specialists.

---Are the differences between agricultural (cooperative) extension, general extension, and academic departments more sharply drawn by university traditions and administrative structure than conditions actually warrant. The cooperative extension service aided by years of Federal and state subsidy, has often created a semiautonomous division

> within the university structure. General extension, which includes adult-education and other non-credit programs, is often looked upon as a step-sister in the university system. The academic departments, many of which insulate themselves from community involvement, are sometimes responsible for forcing extension services to develop independent or duplicative structures."[14]

C. New Organizational Arrangements.

The successful Federal-State-County cooperative arrangements of the Agricultural Extension Service and the experiences under Title I could combine in a model for establishing an Urban Extension Service. The present 2/3 Federal funding could be matched by 1/3 shared between State, City and Institution sources. Allocation of Federal funds to states and to urban areas would be on the basis of population, with all funds flowing through a Governor designated agency of state government to Urban-Grant Colleges and Universities in the urban areas. If a suburban unit chose not to participate, its population would not be counted in calculating the funding allocation for that urban area. The authority for local program determination would be vested at the local level, the level closest to those affected by the programs. While program determination would be a cooperative effort at the local level between local government, community citizens and all

---

[14] Urban Extension, Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, 477 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10022, October, 1966, pp. 7-8.

participating Urban-Grant Colleges and Universities, all program funds at the local level would go for program expenses of participating colleges and universities.

Since the allocation of funds to the Urban-Grant Colleges and Universities would be based upon a plan approved annually by the state agency and the Federal office, a Program Review Board would be needed at the local level which could establish policies and approve local plans. Such a program review board could consist of representatives from each participating Urban-Grant College or University plus an equal number of government representatives appointed by the heads of participating governments and an equal number of citizen representatives elected by voters of participating governments on a population basis. The Policy Review Board could designate a local unit to administer funds at the local level.

Note that many of the present Title I features would be continued in the proposed Urban Extension Serfice, such as (1) any eligible institution of higher education could be designated as an Urban-Grant College or University, and (2) a state administrative agency would submit a state plan and receive and disburse Federal funds. The largest difference would be that each urban area would have to submit a single plan for its programs. As many governmental units in each urban area could participate as wished in the program by

providing representatives to the Program Review Board and assisting with program matching funds.

This administrative arrangement is designed to accomplish two important objectives:

1. To obtain involvement of local government and local citizens at the program planning and policy level, and

2. To place the Urban-Grant Colleges and Universities squarely in the middle of what is often a struggle between units of local government and local citizens. This second point is considered important in helping urban areas with conflict resolution. If colleges and universities cannot play this role in urban communities, who can?

D. A New Urban Research System

As mentioned in recounting Title I problems, there is no well organized system of urban research to support community service work of colleges and universities. Urban Observatories have potential, but have a serious limitation as presently organized in that their advisory committees and agenda are controlled by the heads of the city governments. More workable would be a system organized locally along the lines suggested for the Urban Extension Service, and, in fact, the same Program Review Board representing urban government, citizens and higher education institutions could advise on research policy and program decisions at the local level. Hopefully HUD funds could feed directly to the unit in a local Urban-Grant College or University designated to administer research funds by the Program Review Board on the basis of an annual research plan approved by the local Board of HUD. Having the same

Program Review Board approve both the Urban Extension and Urban Research plans would achieve a measure of coordination between research and application which is often lacking.

The same amount of money should be invested in urban research through this Urban Research Service as would be invested in the Urban Extension Service.

D. Urban Extension Service Program Guidelines

When the trends and problems outlines earlier are reviewed, it is apparent that emphasis should be on funding institutional programs on a long-term basis rather than on funding short-term projects. Needed is institutional capacity to deal with a variety of problems, and to develop this institutional capacity an institution needs assurance of probable program continuity in order to build a capable and committed staff. Related to this is the need to carefully develop an institutional commitment to either (1) turn its programs over to agencies having problem solving responsibilities for continued operation whenever possible or (2) build the programs into the regular institutional budget as soon as possible in order to free Urban Extension Service funds for other programs.

Another important guideline which should be followed is that program emphasis should be on increasing the ability of those having problem solving responsibilities to perform these responsibilities more adequately rather than on encouraging direct problem solving activity by college and university personnel except on a demonstration basis.

V. Summary

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has demonstrated that institutions of higher education can make an important contribution to the solution of community problems through community service projects. But there are, after four years of funding, well recognized limitations, the greatest of which is lack of adequate program funds and mounting program needs, particularly for programs relating to the problems of the poor in our central cities.

Title I now seems to be at a crossroads. Some would in their disillusionment throw the babyout with the wash. Other, including myself, feel Title I has great potential if we are intelligent enough to recast it in ways which would see it gain fresh support. The key is the need for college and university assistance in meeting the growing urban crises. The great potential is in developing Title I into an Urban Extension Service with organizational linkages between Federal, state and urban governments, urban citizens, and Urban-Grant Colleges and Universities.

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUL 9 1969
on Adult Education